DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 459 153 SP 040 373

AUTHOR	DeSpain, B. C.; Johnson, Judy A.
TITLE	In the Teacher/Service/Scholar Model: What Is Valued as "Teaching" in the Promotion and Tenure Process?
PUB DATE	2001-03-00
NOTE	12p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; Deans; Higher Education; Scholarship; Teacher Promotion; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teaching (Occupation); Tenure

ABSTRACT

This study examined what deans of colleges of education considered important activities and elements of teaching, also noting their beliefs about activities related to scholarship and service. Researchers reviewed data from the National Survey of Deans of Colleges of Education, created a list of 20 descriptors of teaching elements of the professorate, and mailed a survey to deans nationwide. Results indicated that over 70 percent of the respondents considered 4 of the 20 items important teaching activities (e.g., developed/authored a course for the Internet and supervised a field experience/internship/externship for a degree program or licensure). About half of the respondents agreed that chairing/directing student research projects for graduate degrees was an important teaching activity. None of the top four items was among the top four considered important for promotion or tenure. Three items were considered important for service by about 70 percent of respondents (e.g., authored a literature review leading to department curricular change and authored a software program related to professional duties). Four items were considered important for scholarship by about 70 percent of respondents (e.g., teaching/conducting skill-specific workshops and mentoring new faculty). (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 459 153

In the Teacher/Service/Scholar Model: What is Valued as "Teaching: in the Promotion and Tenure Process?

B.C. DeSpain and Judy A. Johnson

March 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B.C. DeSpain
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

SP040373

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IN THE TEACHER/SERVICE/SCHOLAR MODEL:

WHAT IS VALUED AS "TEACHING" IN THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS?

Introduction

The evolving nature of the professorate in higher education has been the object of significant study, reflection, research, and discussion for well over a decade. Those knowledgeable with the objectives of the professorate will generally agree that there are three well-defined components to the professorate. Those three components are teaching, scholarship (research and publication), and service with most agreeing that at least a fourth component exists, although it is less defined and frequently referred to simply as "other". Some writers, however, including these current authors, prefer to think of this fourth component as "enhancing the profession or person". The major emphasis of this discussion, however, will remain for the immediate future, upon the three primary components.

Boyer (1992), in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, first questioned the appropriateness of placing major emphasis on research at the exclusion of teaching and service. Glassic, Huber, and Maehoff (1997) in Scholarship Reassessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate, echoed the feelings of Boyer and suggested that the concept of service was suffering in importance and structure. Both works argued that there should be some measure of equity among the three elements of the professorate.

In two previous national research efforts (Heeney, Gould, DeSpain, 2000; DeSpain, Heeney, & Livingston, 1998), findings on the Scholarship and Service components of the Teacher/ Service/Scholarship model have been reported. We now turn our attention to the last of the three major components of the professorate as identified by Boyer (1990). Just as

experienced in the two earlier national surveys, once again the authors have been surprised by the findings recorded in the survey of Deans of Colleges of Education at regional universities.

Teaching, one might logically assume, is easily identified and understood. After all, we have all experienced teaching throughout the formal educational process and beyond. It should be far easier to identify those activities of a professor which are "teaching" than it was to identify activities which were "service" or "scholarship". Not only did this prove not to be the case, but determining what significance "teaching" activities have in the promotion and tenure process remains clouded.

Background and Procedure of the Study

The current national survey of Deans of Colleges of Education addressing the activities and elements of "Teaching", had its origins many years ago in a study of faculty demographics. That study of forty colleges and universities which were accredited by the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was replicated with the same institutions in 1996. Among the remarkable findings revealed when comparing the results of the two studies was the dramatic change which had occurred in the area of Scholarship. Many more and different activities were reported on NCATE reports as "Scholarship" in the 1995-96 era than had appeared in the 1969-70 study. The initial effort to identify a list of all activities reported by faculty as "scholarship" eventually produced a list of thirty-eight (38) items. Those thirty-eight (38) descriptive items were contained in the first national survey which asked Deans of Colleges of Education to tell us how important each item was in the mind of the Dean with regard to the Tenure and Promotion process at their respective institutions. Deans were asked to rate all items on a Likert scale of one (1) to five (5) rankings with one (1) indicating "Unimportant" and five (5) indicating "Very Important". Additionally, the Deans were asked

to give their opinion on each of the thirty-eight (38) items as to whether he/she considered the activity to be "Scholarship","Service", or "Teaching", or "Other".

When several of the items on the survey which had been reported by faculty as "Scholarship" in the faculty vitae section of the NCATE report were identified by a substantial portion of the Deans as something other than "Scholarship", it was decided to attempt to study the issues of "Service" and then finally "Teaching". The "Service" survey instrument contained a total of forty-five (45) descriptions of activities considered by a panel of experts to be service-oriented activities. Again, the Deans of Colleges of Education were asked to do as before and consider the merit of each activity for significance in promotion and tenure. They were again asked to indicate whether (in their opinion) the activity was "Service", "Scholarship", "Teaching", or "Other".

In preparing for this study of "Teaching", the authors reviewed the first two surveys as did a panel of experts. Selecting items from the earlier surveys as well as adding other selected items eventually yielded a list of twenty (20) descriptors of "Teaching" elements of the Professorate. Considerable additional attention was given to the selection of public universities across the nation to be included in this study. The earlier surveys had used NCATE accreditation and membership in the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) as criteria for inclusion in the surveys. This time a concerted effort was made to identify and include public institutions in each of the fifty (50) states.

In addition to the above criteria, an effort was made to exclude Research I institutions, the 'State' University of each state, and the land-grant institutions of each state. The focus was directed so as to concentrate on regional universities. An attempt was made to identify at least two such public institutions in each state with the optimum being three (3) such representative

institutions. In the final analysis, one hundred twenty- (120) institutions, representing forty-eight (48) states, were identified and survey instruments were mailed to the Deans of Colleges of Education of these 120 institutions. A total of sixty-four (64) instruments were returned which represented a fifty-three percent (53%) return rate. Sixty-three (63) of the sixty-four (64) returned instruments were found to be usable and were included in the final data tabulations.

(Insert/Reference Table I)

Findings

Analysis of the "Teaching" column of Table I reveals that four items (8,12,13, and 19) were considered by more than seventy percent (70%) of the responding Deans of Colleges of Education as teaching activities. These four activities are the only activities to demonstrate much agreement as "Teaching" activities as only one other item (item 2) had as much as fifty percent (50%) agreement among the responding Deans. Interestingly, none of the four top items (8. 12,13, 19), were among the top four means as important in either the Promotion or Tenure process. All four, however, were in the top ten (10) or upper one-half (1/2) in means for promotion and tenure, although barely.

Items six (6), ten (10), eleven (11), and eighteen (18) each were considered by the Deans as less than "somewhat important" (value of three (3) on the Likert scale rating) in both the tenure and promotion process. These means ranging from two point six (2.6) to two point nine (2.9), were the four lowest means (ranks of 17, 18, 19, and 20) of the twenty (20) items in the survey indicating that they were the least significant in the promotion and tenure process. Items six (6) and eleven (11) were, however, considered "Teaching" by over forty percent (40%) of the Deans, and item ten (10) had thirty-eight point three percent (38.3%) of the Deans agreeing that it was also "Teaching". The percentage of Deans considering items six (6), ten

(10), eleven (11), and eighteen (18) as teaching was sufficient to rank these items ninth (9^{th}), tenth (10th), eighth (8^{th}), and fifteenth (15th) respectively among the twenty items on the survey. Once again, items considered by a significant percentage of the Deans to be "Teaching", do not rank as "very important" in the promotion and tenure process.

Analysis of the column headed "Service" reveals that three items had high agreement among Deans as "Service" activities with items four (4), seven, (7), and nine (9) gathering seventy-one point nine percent (71.9%), seventy point seven (70.7%), and sixty-nine percent (69%) respectfully. No other item was considered "Service" by more than one-third (1/3) of the Deans. Interestingly, items four (4) and seven (7) are among the top four (4) means in both Promotion and Tenure, and item nine (9) also is in the top ten (10) in importance in both activities.

When the "Scholarship" column is viewed, one finds that again four (4) items (15, 16, 17, and 18) were considered by over seventy percent (70%) of the responding Deans as "Scholarship" with no other item having above forty-five percent (45%) agreement among the Deans. Interestingly, while all four (4) items were considered "Scholarship", none of the four were considered as very important in the Promotion and Tenure process as the mean for each was in the bottom one-half (1/2) in rankings.

One item (item 3) in the column headed "Other" probably deserves comment as it had agreement from twenty-seven percent (27%) of the Deans that it was properly considered as "Other" – that is not teaching, service, or scholarship. It is duly noted that twenty-two percent (22%) of the Deans considered this item – "Development of a professional portfolio model for the Department" – as "Teaching", while thirteen percent (13%) called it "Service", and thirty-

seven percent (37%) considered it "Scholarship". It was about the middle of the means in importance for both Promotion and Tenure.

In viewing the findings as presented in Table I, the authors should, perhaps, offer the reminder that the twenty (20) descriptive items were all items indicated as "Teaching" elements of the Professorate by either respondents from earlier surveys or by the panel of experts use to validate the survey instrument. When developing the "Teaching" column, it is notable that four items (7, 15, 16, and 17) were all considered "Teaching" by less than seven percent (7%) of the respondent Deans. One of the items (item 7) was contained in both the earlier "Scholarship" and "Service" surveys. In this survey six point nine percent (6.9%) of the respondents considered it "Teaching" as compared to four point eight percent (4.8%) on the "Service" survey and thirty percent (30%) on the "Scholarship" survey. Item seventeen (17) also appeared on the "Service" survey where nine point five percent (9.5%), as compared to only three point five percent (3.5%) on this survey viewed it as "Teaching". It is noteworthy, however, that eighty-four percent (84%) of the Deans on this "Teaching" survey considered the activity as "Scholarship", whereas zero percent (0%) of the Deans on the "Service" survey considered it "Teaching", but eighty-five point seven percent (85.7%) of the Deans on that survey (Service) considered it "Service". This item, it is pointed out, is obviously considered important by Deans of Colleges of Education in both the Promotion and Tenure process as the mean score on the one to five (1-5) Likert Scale is in the three to three point three (3.0 to 3.3) range in all four calculations. One might conclude, therefore, that this activity is relatively important in the Promotion and Tenure process, but Deans of Colleges of Education differ in which areas of the Professorate it should be considered. This is an example of what was a common occurrence throughout the three surveys. An item may have been noted as important

in the Tenure and Promotion process by the Deans, but they strongly differed in their views as to whether it should be considered Teaching, Scholarship, or Service. Perhaps this notation appropriately frames the issue under consideration in these three research efforts.

Observations, Conclusions, and Recommendations

After reviewing the data presented from this "Teaching" survey and those done earlier on "Scholarship" and "Service", the cynic might conclude that Deans of Colleges of Education do not know what they believe is important in the Promotion and Tenure process. Furthermore, the cynic might also be inclined to conclude that those same Deans do not even know whether an activity is Teaching, Scholarship, or Service. Certainly, it is obvious that there is little agreement in these matters. The present researchers and authors will, however, resist such temptations as one is currently a Dean of a College of Education and the other aspires to such in the future.

Rather than capitulate to cynicism, it is imperative for all of us – Deans, chairs, other higher education administrators, and most importantly, beginning faculty – that a serious effort begin to develop a model for wide-spread utilization as to what counts in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in the Promotion and Tenure process.

We believe it is possible to develop a comprehensive model, incorporating teaching, service, and scholarship, and other activities of the Professorate. Such a model, we believe, could build in elements unique to each of the Colleges of the University such as Agriculture, Business, Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Humanities, Fine Arts, etc. for use with each respective college. Further, we believe it is time to bring a higher level of professionalism to the Promotion and Tenure process. There is little about a process which can be deemed "professional" when the aspirant does not know what is expected, and the one having the final

word in the process remains at complete liberty to alter the criteria at any time or to ignore any or all indicators of professional growth, maturation, contribution, and excellence. We believe that the time has come to address this matter in a forthright fashion. Our future efforts will be dedicated to the collection of additional data and to the development of such a model.

REFERENCES

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

DeSpain, B.C., Heeney, M. & Livingston, M. (l998). The evolution of "publish or perish": what counts as "other". National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal Electronic. 15E (4), 73-82.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997). Scholarship reassessed: Evaluation of the professoriate. An Ernest L. Boyer Project of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heeney, M., Gould, M.W. & DeSpain, B.C. (2000). How deans of colleges of education view service: The tenure and promotion process. ". National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal Electronic. 17E (4), 113-120.

TEACHER/SERVICE/SCHOLAR MODEL

Table I

Descriptor of Activity	Teaching %	Service %	Scholarship %	Other %	Promotion Mean	Tenure Mean
1. Leadership in program or course revision	45.0	5.0	45.0	33.0	3.6032	3.6452
2. Chaired/directed student research project for M.S./Ed.S. degree	51.7	25.9	17.2	3.4	3.6349	3.3750
3. Development of professional portfolio model for department	22.2	13.0	37.0	27.8	3.2373	3.1897
4. Authored review of literature leading to Dept. curriculur change	17.5	71.9	5.3	3.5	3.5556	3.7097
5. Chaired a dissertation committee	45.1	7.8	39.2	5.9	3.1731	3.2182
6. Served on dissertation committee	40.4	9.6	44.2	3.8	2.8333	2.8929
7. Authored software program related to professional duties	6.9	70.7	15.5	5.2	3.6349	3.4746
8. Developed/authored a course for the Internet	73.2	21.4	3.6	1.8	3.5070	3.4390
9. Developed/authored audio/video series for use in education	25.9	69.0	3.4	1.7	3.4921	3.4667
10. Organized/led university study groups–faculty in foreign country	38.3	18.3	38.3	5.0	2.7460	2.7419
11. Organized/led university study student group in a foreign country	44.8	6.9	41.4	6.9	2.6667	2.7581
12. Supervised a field experience/ internship/externship for degree program or licensure	87.7	5.3	1.8	18.0	3.3810	3.2952
13. Participated/initiated - alternative delivery model (ITV,web,on-line)	79.3	13.8	6.9		3.3281	3.2787
14. Student advising-degree program	30.9	32.7	32.7	1.8	3.8254	3.8871
15. Teaching/conducting skill-specific workshops	5.3	3.6	71.4	10.7	3.0952	3.2419
16. Sharing specific learning /knowledge with other faculty via workshops	5.3	19.3	71.9	3.5	3.0952	3.2097
17. Serving as mentor for new faculty	3.5	8.8	84.2	3.5	3.1290	3.0968
18. Providing/teaching to adjunct professors specific course content	16.9	3.4	74.6	3.4	2.8730	3.2097
19. Teaming with a junior dept. member to deliver/develop course	71.9	8.8	15.8	1.8	3.2381	3.2097
20. Interdisciplinary efforts-teaching, speaking, or presenting on educational issues to other colleges, classes, or fields of University faculty	30.9	32.7	32.7	1.8	3.2381	3.2258

** Columns do not total to 100% because some Deans indicated more than one area or did not respond in any area.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Educational
Research and Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed
April 19, 2002